

Serial No. 10/069,371

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Widegren in view of Hart.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Widegren in view of Hart further in view of Architectural Aspects for the Evolution of Mobile Communications Towards UMTS by Berruto.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Widegren in view of Hart further in view of Boudreaux.

Claim 1

On a preliminary point, as mentioned in e.g Widegren column 5 lines 38 to 49, PSTN/ISDN is connection-orientated (i.e. circuit switched) whilst Internet is connectionless (packet-switched). It follows that Widegren does not disclose a packet switched network architecture comprising ... two core networks.

The teaching of Widegren provides no technical problem to be solved by Hart and no motivation for the skilled reader of Widegren to look at Hart.

Widegren and Hart relate to different technical fields. Widegren relates to UMTS mobile cellular networks whilst Hart relates to Ethernet LANs. The skilled reader of Widegren would be making an inventive step to even look to the teaching of Hart.

In the unlikely event that the skilled reader were to look to the teaching of Hart, she would immediately dismiss Hart as incompatible with Widegren because

- (i) Hart relates to a different technical field,
- (ii) the teaching of Hart Fig.1 and column 4 lines 20-29 indicates that "frames can also be forwarded across the STP Backup Network B-C, termed DLS path B-C" but does not disclose a "network switches packet transmissions from each terminal to one of the at least two core networks in dependence on the capacity of the respective core networks" (emphasis added).

Serial No. 10/069,371

Furthermore, Ethernet STP networks as disclosed by Hart are not core networks, as required by the present claim 1.

It follows that claim 1 meets the standard of 35USC103(a) over the cited art.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is patentable not least on the basis that it depends on an allowable amended claim 1.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1. Claim 4 is patentable for the same reasons as laid-out in respect of claim 1 above.

Claim 7


Claim 7 is allowable not least on the basis that it is dependent on an allowable independent claim 1.

Serial No. 10/069,371

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' attorney, **John B. MacIntyre**, at 630 979 46327 .

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Roberts
Sutha Sivagnanasundaram

By: 
John B. MacIntyre, Attorney
Reg. No. 41170
Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 1/6/09

Send all correspondence to:
Docket Administrator (Room 2F-192)
Alcatel-Lucent
600-700 Mountain Ave.
P.O. Box 636
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636